JOB EVALUATION

Manitoba
Labour
Pay Equity
Bureau

88-05814/

JOB EVALUATION

©Pay Equity Bureau
Manitoba Labour
609-386 Broadway
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3C 3R6
(204) 945-0475

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	i
Requirements of the Act	ii
Job Evaluation	1
Definition and Description	1
Job Evaluation as a Tool for Implementing Pay Equity	1
Gender-Bias in Job Evaluation Systems	2
Types of Job Evaluation Systems	3
-Ranking	3
-Job Classification or Grade Description	3
-Factor Comparison	3
-Point-Rating	3
-Policy Capturing	4
Determination of Classes	4
Choice and Definition of Factors	5
-Gender Bias	5
-Job Characteristics	6
-Gender-Neutrality	9
-Discriminatory Job Factors	12
-Definition of Job Factors	14
Weighting of Factors	14
-Gender-Biased Weighting	14
-Relative Weighting	17
-Factors and Sub Factors	17
Job Analysis	20
Footnotes	21
Bibliography	22
Glossary of Terms	24

PREFACE

Manitoba's Pay Equity Act requires specific employers and representatives of employees to examine their wage setting practices to determine if gender discrimination exists.

The first step in the process is the development or selection of a job evaluation system (JES). The JES will be applied to jobs predominantly performed by women and to jobs predominantly performed by men. The Act states that gender-dominance exists where there are 10 or more employees performing a particular job, 70% of whom are of the same sex. Other job classes can be included by agreement of the bargaining parties.

Some form of job evaluation is essential in the process of implementing pay equity. Measuring jobs against the common factors of skill, effort, responsibility and working conditions makes it possible to determine whether job classes are of equal or comparable value, and thus, whether female-dominated job classes are being paid equitably.

The purpose of this booklet is to acquaint parties with the requirements of the Act which relate to this important first step in the process, and to outline the types of job evaluation currently used. The booklet also discusses the problem of potential gender-bias in job evaluation systems.

Other publications in this series are:

Book 2 - Job Analysis

Book 3 - Interpretation and Wage Adjustments

REQUIREMENTS*	Legislative Reference: Direct	Legislative Reference: Indirect
1. The purpose of the Act is to establish the principle of pay equity in Manitoba and to inform employers, unions and employees, in both the public and private sectors, of the principles and practices of pay equity.	Section 2	
2. Pay equity is defined as a compensation practice which is based primarily on the value of the work performed, regardless of the gender of the employee. It includes the requirement that no employer shall establish or maintain a difference between the wages paid to male and female employees, who are performing work of equal or comparable value.	Section 1 - definition of "pay equity"	Section 6(2)
3. Value is assessed using the composite of skill, effort and responsibility normally required in the performance of the work and the conditions under which the work is performed.	Section 6 (1)	Section 6(2)
4. No employee's wages can be reduced to implement pay equity.	Section 7(1); 7(2)	

*The Pay Equity Act, S.M. 1985-86, c. 21. C.C.S.M. c.P.-13.

5. Pay equity is mandatory in the Manitoba Civil Service, Crown corporations, and 27 external agencies comprising 23 hospitals and 4 universities. Under the act, the civil service commenced implementation October 1, 1985, while for the other entities the process began as of October 1, 1986. The external agencies are listed in the Schedule at the end of the Act.	Section 8(1); 13(1) Schedule A	Section 1 - definitions of "Crown entity" and "external agency"; Section 3
6. Other external agencies (such as personal care homes) which receive a substantial portion of their revenue from provincial government funding can be required to implement pay equity by regulation. Local governments and school divisions are not covered by the Act.	Section 1 - definition of "external agency" Section 18 (1); 18(2); 18(3); 18(4); 19(c)	
7. Three features of Manitoba's legislation distinguish it from other existing equal value legislation in Canada: it is pro-active, it makes use of the collective bargaining process, and it calls for the establishment of a Pay Equity Bureau.	Section 8(1); 8(2); 8(3); 13(1); 13(2); 13(3); 5(1)	Section 11; 16; 9(1); 14(1)
8. The pro-active approach obliges the legislated public sector employers to apply a single, gender-neutral, job evaluation system to female-dominated and male-dominated classes of employees in order to compare the value of the work performed. The purpose of the job evaluation process is to identify pay inequities.	Section 9(1); 14(1)	

9. A class is considered gender-dominated if 70% or more of those in a class of 10 or more people are of the same gender. In the case of employers with more than 500 employees, other classes may be considered gender-dominated if negotiated by the bargaining parties involved.	Section 1 - definitions of "female-dominated class" and "male-dominated class"	
10. Through the collective bargaining process required by the Act, employees play a vitally important role in the implementation of pay equity. Unions, representatives of non-unionized employees, and the employer are obliged to bargain in good faith, making every reasonable effort to reach agreements respecting this process.	Section 8(2); 8(3); 13(2); 13(3)	Section 1 - definition of "employee representative"
11. A Pay Equity Bureau has been established in Manitoba Labour, managed by an executive director with broad powers to monitor compliance with the legislation. Public sector employers must file reports with the bureau. These reports will be summarized in the executive director's annual report, which is to be tabled by the Minister responsible in the Legislature. Should the bargaining process break down, the executive director will also have the right to refer unresolved matters to adjudication.	Section 5(1); 5(2);5(3); 9(2); 14(2); 5(2)(c); 5(4); 10(2); 10(3); 15(2); 15(3)	Section 10(3); 15(3)

12. In addition to these important monitoring and reporting functions, the bureau also has a mandate to provide pay equity information and assistance to employers, employees, and bargaining agents, in the public and private sectors.	Section 5(3)(a)	Section 5(2)(a); 2(b)
13. A pay equity commissioner was designated to oversee the day to day details of implementation within the civil service, while the Act provides that the other entities may designate a person as pay equity officer to perform a similar role for those organizations. The pay equity commissioner and any appointed officers are obliged to co-operate with the executive director of the Pay Equity Bureau so that the executive director can effectively monitor progress and provide any needed assistance.	Section 12(1); 12(2); 17(1); 17(2)	
14. The Act contains specific deadlines for reaching agreements. In the provincial civil service, implementation began on October 1, 1985. An agreement respecting the development or selection and application of a job evaluation system was to be reached by June 30, 1986. Crowns, designated hospitals and universities began the process October 1986 and had until June 30, 1987 to complete this stage.	Section 8(1); 9(1); 13(1); 14(1)	

15. Once job evaluation is completed, a second round of negotiations deals with the exact allocation and phasing-in of necessary wage adjustments. This second agreement was reached September 30, 1987 by the civil service, while the other entities were scheduled for completion by September 30, 1988. Wage adjustments follow completion of this stage.	Section 9(1); 14(1)	
16. Impasses in the civil service could be referred to an arbitration board. The other entities could be referred to the Labour Board for adjudication.	Section 10(1) through to 10(9); 15(1) through to 15(8)	
17. Pay equity wage adjustments may be phased in over 4 years, following completion of the second agreement.	Section7(3)(b); 9(1); 14(1)	Section 1- definition of "wages"
18. In any twelve-month period, however, no employer is obliged to allocate more than 1% of the previous year's payroll for pay equity wage adjustments.	Section 7(3)(a)	
19. Although the Act makes provision for regulations, to date* no regulations have been enacted.	Section 19	
20. Nothing in this Act affects the existing obligations of employers or the rights of employees under the "equal pay for equal work" provisions of The Employment Standards Act.	Section 4(2)	

*January 1988

Definitions And Description

Job evaluation involves a process of comparing jobs to determine the relative position of one job to another in a wage or salary hierarchy. Every employer who pays wages of different levels has some form of job evaluation, ranging from the "boss's gut feeling" as to the worth of the tasks being performed, to a formal and systematic job evaluation system sometimes supplemented with market surveys. It is the use of formal and systematic comparison procedures that is usually referred to as "job evaluation."

Job evaluation is concerned with the content of jobs, not with individual performance or the innate abilities of particular workers. Job evaluation is a completely separate and distinct process from "performance appraisal." Some employers do establish systems of performance appraisal which are used to evaluate how well a particular person is discharging his or her duties. Job evaluation does not contradict or hinder this process.

Job Evaluation As A Tool For Implementing Pay Equity

Job evaluation is a tool that can be used to detect gender discrimination in wage setting practices. Techniques of job evaluation have been in existence for more than forty years. The Pay Equity Act requires affected parties to choose and implement a JES, but only for the limited purpose of assuring gender equity within an organization. For this reason the legislation requires only gender-dominated groups to be evaluated.

Job evaluation should be used to determine whether there is a dual salary structure within an organization - one for traditional "men's" work and another for traditional "women's" work. Job evaluation should also provide information that will assist in determining the kind of salary adjustments necessary to ensure that each organization has a female salary structure or salary line that is the same as the male salary structure or salary line.

Gender-Bias In Job Evaluation Systems

Even where employers have instituted and maintained job evaluation for purposes of wage setting, women's work may have been undervalued and underpaid.

A major reason for this phenomenon is that historically, many if not most employers using job evaluation have utilized a separate JES for different occupational categories such as clerical jobs, manual labour jobs and managerial jobs. Thus, sex-segregated job families have been treated independent of one another.

Where multiple plans are used within an organization, job descriptions may be based on dissimilar job content features; evaluations may be based on different factors, and similar factors may be given different weightings. Such practices make it impossible to compare the relative value of contributions made by the sex-segregated occupational groups. Salary setting practices may be significantly different.

One example of this multiple plan problem occurred in the American Telephone & Telegraph Company (AT&T), where different schemes were used for non-managerial and managerial employees. The managerial scheme gave a high point value to customer contact for managerial (male-dominated) jobs, but almost no points for customer contact for non-managerial (female-dominated jobs). In fact, the company randomly screened telephone calls to assess the quality of assistance operators gave to customers. Clearly AT&T valued positive customer contact, but it was not consistent in its approach to evaluating the job contributions of female-dominated and male-dominated groups. Gender-neutrality requires that whatever an organization regards as a valuable job contribution, it should be equally so regarded whether such a contribution is made by men or women.[1]

The Pay Equity Act explicitly responds to the problem created by the multiple plan approach by prescribing that every affected employer is required to seek agreement on a single JES, which will apply to all male-dominated and female-dominated classes of employees within the organization. Thus, for pay equity purposes, these systems will either have to be broadened to apply to all employees with appropriate modifications if necessary, or replaced with a new single system.

It is not surprising that social values which have led to the undervaluing of women's work have found their way into job evaluation systems.

In fact, gender-bias can creep into these systems at every stage of their design and application. Some of the potential problem areas, each of which will be discussed in this section, are listed below:

-choice and definition of factors
-weighting of factors
-evaluation process
-wage adjustments

Because women's work in our society is generally undervalued, most if not all organizations should expect to find a dual salary structure when they objectively evaluate their compensation systems. If a job evaluation plan does not detect the existence of such a structure, either the organization is not discriminating in its pay structure or the JES and/or its application are gender-biased.

Types Of Job Evaluation Systems

Although the Act requires a single JES be chosen, there is no universal system prescribed. Whether the system meets the requirement of the legislation that it be a gender-neutral system depends on the application of the system. The same plan could be applied appropriately in one entity and inappropriately in another.

Some of the recognized methods of comparing jobs are described below:

1. A ranking system requires that the jobs in the organization are ranked in order on the basis of their importance to the organization or general difficulty.

2. A job classification or grade description approach measures the overall job against a pre-determined scale consisting of several degrees of job worth. Evaluators compare each job against the scale and slot it into the grade which matches its definition most closely.

3. The factor comparison method compares jobs by making judgements concerning which jobs contain more of certain compensable factors than others. Key jobs or benchmarks are selected and broken down into their factors. The factors are weighted by percentage or dollar amounts. The other jobs are compared to these benchmarks on a factor-by-factor basis and ranked accordingly. The results are combined and assigned a numerical value.

4. The point-rating method of job evaluation is the most widely used form of job evaluation. A rating scale is constructed for each factor, which includes a definition of the factor, several defined divisions or degrees for

each factor and a point score for each such degree. This system involves breaking jobs down and grading them according to compensable factors and sub-factors. Each job gets a numerical score on each of these factors. The scores are added up to obtain the value of the job. The point-rating system has been used for pay equity purposes in a number of jurisdictions.

5. **The policy capturing** approach is a method of job evaluation which relies heavily on statistical procedures for capturing the job factors which are currently valued by an employer and identifies wage discrimination in the pay policy. The point counts and rankings are generated statistically directly from detailed questionnaires. The final set of factors and weights are then adjusted to remove any wage discrimination in the wage structure.

Although there are several types of job evaluation systems in use, the steps involved are basically the same. Determining what factors and sub-factors will be used in assessing the relative value is generally the first step.

Determination Of Classes

To determine which classes will be reviewed in the process, the Act defines "female-dominated" and "male-dominated" classes as having 10 or more incumbents of whom 70% or more are female or male.

Each entity must review its present circumstance to assess the definition of class as it relates to its organization. There are a variety of classification systems in place presently, some of which are easily adapted to the legislated definition while others require some degree of rationalization.

Organizations may include gender-dominated classes of fewer than 10 incumbents to provide a better organizational cross-section of male or female job classes for comparability. Two main factors may be taken into account for the inclusion of classes of fewer than 10 incumbents;

1. Where classes are or have been traditionally gender-dominated in the labour force at large. Canada Census data may be useful in assessing this.

2. Where classes may have been left out of existing series, for example Clerks 1, 2 and 4 are gender-dominant by legislated definition, but Clerk 3, while female-dominated, has less that 10 incumbents. Clerk 3 may be included for pay equity purposes because of its relationship with its present series.

The date the entity is required to commence pay equity is the date at which all determinations are made regarding the dominance and num-

ber within a class: civil service - October 1, 1985; Crown entities and external agencies - October 1, 1986.

Choice And Definition Of Factors

1. Gender-Bias

Gender-bias in the selection of factors and in their definitions is a particularly serious departure from gender-neutrality because it is through these factors that job-related contributions will be recognized and rewarded.

Frequently, factors are derived from the job descriptions. Thus, if job contributions made by female-dominated jobs are consistently overlooked, ignored or improperly detailed in job descriptions, there will be a gender-bias carried over into selection of factors. Even if factors are selected without particular regard to job descriptions, the same stereotyped notions that have led to overlooking job content associated with women's jobs can also unconsciously influence the definition of job factors. Steinberg and Haignere point out:

. . . working with mentally ill or retarded persons may be overlooked as a stressful working condition, while working with noisy machinery may not. Poor working conditions such as lifting heavy weights or working out of doors may be valued, while eye strain associated with VDTs may be entirely ignored. Or, nurses who supervise employees and care for patients only received points for supervision, because the way "human relations know how" is defined largely excluded skills necessary in working with people other than those supervised.[2]

Helen Remick has described another example of sex bias in the definition of working conditions in many job evaluation plans. This factor was also equated with "being male", when it was defined purely in terms of dirt, noise, heavy lifting, and physical exertion. The concept of "dirt" itself was given a male bias; dirt meant working in an unclean environment with substances that left you "dirty." Remick uses "axle grease" as the archetypal example of male dirt recognized in job evaluation systems. There generally has been little recognition of the definition of "dirt" frequently associated with women's work in sterile environments, such as the necessity of dealing with blood, pus, vomit, urine and feces.[3]

Factors can be derived from non-gender-biased job content information. The factors chosen should be representative of the whole range of work being evaluated. Because of the tendency to overlook factors

which are relevant to female-dominated occupations, it is advisable that parties focus on female-dominated jobs during the process of selecting factors or determining whether fixed factors offered in a consultant's plan are acceptable.

2. Job Characteristics

The following is a list of types of characteristics which are commonly found in male and female-dominated jobs. It shows the type of bias that can enter into the choice of job factors. These job characteristics were identified by Rohmert and Rutenfranz in a study sponsored by the West German government (1977). The information below is quoted directly (almost in its entirety) from an abbreviated English version of the study as it appeared in a 1978 paper by Helen Remick.[4]

a. Light versus heavy work. Male-dominate jobs are often characterized by requirements for lifting heavy objects. Evaluation systems which include working conditions give points for heavy lifting requirements. However, female-dominated jobs are not necessarily free of lifting requirements and often require repeated lifting of light (less than 30 lbs.) objects. This repeated lifting is not given points in most evaluation systems. A bias-free system might give points for total weight lifted during a day or for total calorie output in lifting objects. Male jobs are also characterized as involving full body movement; however, female jobs often tend to involve repeated and confined use of only a few muscles, for instance word processing operators. Evaluation systems should be adapted to give value to both kinds of muscle use.

b. Speed and fine motor requirements. Female jobs are often characterized by speed and fine motor requirements; male jobs rarely include these elements, and evaluation systems rarely give weight to these factors. Typing jobs provide a good example: a passing score of 50 words per minute in a five-minute typing test requires over 1,250 individual finger movements, with no more than a total of five errors. A senior typist can easily type 90 words per minute for five minutes with no errors at an average rate 7.5 individual finger movements per second and an error rate of 9 per 2,250 movements sustained for five minutes. A bias-free system would assign points to speed and fine motor control requirements.

c. Sensory decisions. Assembly line jobs requiring visual scanning of material for defects are usually held by women. These jobs re-

quire the ability to decide rapidly whether objects meet certain visual standards. Most evaluation systems do not value this skill; a bias-free system would include a factor for sensory decisions.

d. Level of physical danger. Male jobs are often characterized by a substantial level of physical danger; female jobs rarely include this characteristic. Job evaluation systems usually give credit for this factor.

e. Responsibility for tangible property versus responsibility for persons. Jobs involving responsibility for tangible property are usually held by males; the greater the value of the property, the greater the likelihood that males will hold the job. On the other hand, jobs involving the responsibility for people, especially children, are more likely to be held by women. Job evaluation systems traditionally give credit for responsibility for property but not for people. A bias-free system would include a range of points, from routine "people" responsibility (e.g. day care) to life-and-death responsibility (e.g. intensive care nurse).

f.,g. and h. Level of decision making, level of analysis, and fiscal responsibility. Care should be taken in applying job evaluation systems not to assume that since a job is female-dominated it has low levels of decision making, fiscal responsibility, and analysis. Some job evaluation systems, particularly those that may have been used primarily for managerial jobs, may weight such factors very heavily. For pay equity purposes, a job evaluation system must measure all types of jobs. Therefore, care should be taken to avoid any systemic gender-bias in the weighting.

i. Amount of interruption and simultaneous processing. Many female jobs are characterized by interruptions and requirements of simultaneous processing of information; male jobs tend not to have these characteristics. As an example, many clerical jobs entail not only great accuracy at tasks requiring fine motor control, but require simultaneously that phones be answered and people greeted. Further, these intermittent interruptions must be processed with no increase in error rate on the fine motor control task! Factors should be added to job evaluation systems to ensure fair value be given to the factors of interruption and simultaneous processing.

j. Interpersonal skills. Female jobs have tended to demand, on average, greater interpersonal skills than male jobs; for instance a bank teller as compared to a cabinet maker. Interpersonal skills have not been highly valued in many job evaluations systems, and should be re-

evaluated for possible increased points.

k. Level of education. Some traditional evaluation plans have tended to measure education levels of male-dominated jobs higher than those in women's jobs. Many male jobs have specific training programs while many women's jobs assume that the incumbents have inherent skills or life learned skills used in the performance of their tasks. Skills used in some women's jobs (such as cooking, sewing and cleaning) may not be recognized through typical institutional education but are slowly becoming recognized as having as much technical skill as some male jobs such as a general repairman. In general, male jobs involve considerably more on-the-job training than female jobs; female jobs tend to require "pre-existing" skills. One example, taken from a job evaluation manual, was that of a truck driver requiring twelve months of training, as compared to a typist requiring one month. Yet both positions involve skills often learned (whether by formal or informal means) prior to entry into the paid labour force. Therefore, job evaluation systems should always be checked for the relative weights given on-the-job training versus already acquired skills.

l. Interpretation of negative work condition factors. Job evaluation systems have traditionally put heavy weight on working in cold, wet, noisy and dirty places, factors found most often in male jobs. Factors not considered but found in many female jobs include confinement to small spaces, restricted body movement, use of magnifying equipment (as in assembly of micro-circuitry), and noise from machines such as typewriters, telephones, key punches, and vacuum cleaners. Noise should be measured for both average and peaks, and the other factors not usually considered should be added to evaluation systems.

m. Recent technology. New technologies tend to create inflated salaries for newly created men's jobs, at least until the newness wears off. This newness factor does not always increase salaries in women's jobs to the same degree. For example, systems analysts have benefited proportionally more from computer technology than data entry operators or magnetic card typists. An explicit "newness" factor should benefit all workers in that industrial area.[4]

3. Gender Neutrality

Although JE systems cannot be value free, they should not have a differential impact related to gender. A balanced approach must be taken in the choice and definition of factors. Factors favouring female-dominated job contributions as well as those favouring male-dominated job contributions should be included. The chart on pages 10 and 11 was prepared by the United Kingdom's Equal Opportunities Commission (U.K.E.O.C.)[5]. It divides factors into those which favour female jobs, those which favour male jobs, and those which are neutral.

Where possible the factors should be defined in neutral terms which apply to both male and female jobs. Where examples of jobs or job activities are given as part of factor definitions, care should be taken to include examples chosen from jobs held by women as well as men. If this is not the case, it may indicate the presence of possible gender bias.

GENDER-BIASED AND GENDER-NEUTRAL JOB FACTORS

	Favours Male Jobs			Favours Female jobs	
	Strongly	Weakly	Neutral	Weakly	Strongly
Factors with a time dimension	*Length of service *Experience	*Age *Qualifications *Education *Knowledge *Breadth of know-how *Depth of know-how	*Training period *Level of skill		
Factors with a seniority dimension		*Responsibility for cash or assets *Discretion *Responsibility *Effect of decisions *Supervision of subordinates *Accountability *Decision-making *Planning	*Confidential data/ information		
Factors with a relationship dimension			*Safety of others *Co-operation *Supervising *Creating new business *Communication *Co-ordination *Personal appearance *Expression	*Contacts: internal/ external * Human relations responsibility *Public relations responsibility *Accuracy	*Caring

	Favours Male Jobs			Favours Female jobs	
	Strongly	Weakly	Neutral	Weakly	Strongly
Factors with a physical activity dimension	*Heavy lifting *Physical hazards *Spatial ability *Unpleasant working conditions	*Technical expertise *Responsibility for equipment *Physical skills *Physical effort *Responsibility for standards *Operational knowledge *Knowledge of machinery, tools and materials	*Safety of others *Stamina *Responsibilty for materials *Versatility *Procedural know-how *Fatigue	*Monotony *Visual concentration *Scanning and location of details	*Dexterity *Typing keyboard skills
Factors with a mental activity dimension		*Numerical calculation *Knowledge *Numerical ability *Mathematical reasoning *Problem solving	*Initiative *Originality *Ingenuity *Judgement *Mental effort *Complexity of job *Planning *Verbal comprehension *Verbal expression	*Concentration *Memory *Information ordering	
Factors with a sensory activity dimension		*Differentiating sounds	*Differentiating tastes *Differentiating smells *Visual concentration *Aesthetic appreciation *Tactic sensitivity *Artistic/Musical creativity		

4. Discriminatory Job Factors

If factor scores of jobs performed predominantly by women include a lot of low scores, this may indicate that there is gender bias in the JES. On the other hand, it may be that the JES disproportionately favours male as compared to female jobs because women have been channeled into jobs of lower worth. Careful scrutiny of the system is required to determine the reason for the low scores.

No single litmus test of gender-neutrality in factor selection and definition is available. However, one example of apparently discriminatory job factors contrasted with non-discriminatory job factors has been described by the U.K.E.O.C.[6]. As the following example indicates, factors will be discriminatory if they recognize many aspects of male jobs and very few which relate to female jobs.

a) Example of Discriminatory Job Factors

Factors	Maintenance Fitter	Company Nurse
Each factor is scored on a scale from 1 to 10 (For simplicity no weights have been applied)		
Skill		
Experience in job	10	1
Training	5	7
Responsibility		
For money	0	0
For equipment and machinery	8	3
For safety	3	6
For work done by others	3	0
Effort		
Lifting requirement	4	2
Strength required	7	2
Sustained physical effort	5	1
Conditions		
Physical environment	6	0
Working position	6	0
Hazards	7	0
Total	64	22

This set of factors is discriminatory because it contains many aspects of the male job and very few characteristics which relate to the female job. Also, some of the characteristics which relate to the male job are duplicated, for example, "strength required" duplicates to some extent "sustained physical effort" with the result that a high score on one would very frequently be associated with a high score on the other. The same is true of "lifting requirements" and "strength required". Note that the difference in scores on the factor "experience in job" completely-outweighs the more significant difference in the factor "training".

b) Examples of Non-Discriminatory Job Factors

Factors	Maintenance Fitter	Company Nurse
Each factor is scored on a scale from 1 to 10 (For simplicity no weights have been applied)		
Basic knowledge	6	8
Complexity of task	6	7
Training	5	7
Responsibility for people	3	8
Responsibility for materials and equipment	8	6
Mental effort	5	6
Visual attention	6	6
Physical activity	8	5
Working conditions	6	1
Total	53	54

It is important to ensure that the set of job factors which are used incorporates the important and relevant differentiating characteristics of all the jobs to which the scheme is going to be applied. It is important to check the factor scores of the jobs performed predominantly by female employees and if there are a lot of low scores, or if the set of factors makes no provision for scoring aspects of the female jobs which reflect their value to the company, then the set of factors is discriminatory and should be changed.

5. Definition of Job Factors

After determining the job factors to be used, each factor must be defined. In point systems, degrees or grades of each factor are described and defined. The definitions of factors and degrees are very important as they will guide the evaluators in measuring the extent of each factor in a particular job.

The following is an example of how to define the job factor "Human Relations Skills".[7]

1. **Incidental:** Communication skills are incidental to the nature of the job duties performed.
2. **Basic:** Skills in communicating factual information are necessary in the job.
3. **Intermediate:** Dealing with people in emotionally demanding situations is part of the job.
4. **Important:** Skills in understanding and influencing, motivating, counselling or training people are important job components.
5. **Critical:** Skills in motivating, developing, understanding, persuading and/or counselling people are critical for effective job performance.

Weighting Of Factors

1. Gender-Biased Weighting

Weighting of factors, or assigning their relative importance, is an exercise sometimes carried out by a committee. Many job evaluation plans have pre-set weightings, which may or may not be modified, depending on the plan itself. Value judgements in the weighting of factors are necessary, but they should be carefully scrutinized so they do not result in systemic gender-bias.

A very important sub-factor may be weighted as high as 10% while a relatively unimportant one may receive only 1% of the total eligible points. It is easy to see how gender - bias in the choice and definition of factors can be magnified through the weighting procedures. For example, if management know-how (in male-dominated jobs) is rated 5 times as great as human relations (in female-dominated jobs) know-how, this will obviously have a systemic effect on JES.

The factors with the heaviest and lightest weightings should be double checked to ensure that these can be justified and are not likely to penalize the jobs of one sex.

If most of the factors in which male jobs score high are heavily weighted, whereas most of those in which female jobs score high are given little weight, this is a good indicator of gender-bias in the weighting of factors. If possible, extreme weights, either very high or very low, should be avoided with respect to factors that are exclusively found in jobs predominantly performed by one sex or the other. Using the previous example from the U.K.E.O.C., we can demonstrate. [8]

Factors	Unweighted Scores		Biased Weights	Unweighted Scores		Unbiased Weights	Unweighted Scores	
	Fitter	Nurse		Fitter	Nurse		Fitter	Nurse
Basic Knowledge	6	8	7%	0.42	0.56	5%	0.30	0.40
Complexity of Task	6	7	8%	0.48	0.56	15%	0.90	1.05
Training	5	7	7%	0.35	0.49	15%	0.75	1.05
Responsibility for People	3	8	15%	0.45	1.20	15%	0.45	1.20
Responsibility for Materials and Equipment	8	6	15%	1.20	0.90	15%	1.20	0.90
Mental Effort	5	6	8%	0.40	0.48	10%	0.50	0.60
Visual Attention	6	6	10%	0.60	0.60	10%	0.60	0.60
Physical Activity	8	5	15%	1.20	0.75	10%	0.80	0.50
Working Conditions	6	1	15%	0.90	0.15	5%	0.30	0.05
Total	53	54		6.00	5.66		5.80	6.35

The first set of weights are biased because all the factors on which the male job scored higher have high weights and most of the factors on which the female job scored higher than the male job have low weights. It is unlikely that this particular set of weights could be justified by reference to the importance of these factors to the organization as a whole. The second set of weights is less biased because it is more likely to reflect the value of these various factors to the organizations as a whole and does not unduly favour characteristics of male as opposed to female work. This set of weights widens the gap between the two jobs relative to the unweighted scores, and shows the company nurse to be a higher grade job than the fitter. The biased set of weights actually reversed the situation.

To avoid discrimination resulting from the weighting of factors, extreme weights, either very high or very low, should not be given to factors which are exclusively found in jobs performed predominantly by one sex. An analysis showing the percentage of total points, after weighting, attributable to each factor should be compiled. This would assist in highlighting factors with heavy weightings and provide a relative comparison between factors. The factors with the heaviest and the lightest weightings should then be looked at again to ensure these can be justified and are not likely to penalize the jobs of one sex.

2. Relative Weighting

Once factors are chosen and defined, the relative weighting of factors must then be determined. This process will identify what factors and sub-factors the particular organization considers most valuable. Choice of factors, their definitions and weightings are generally pre-determined in plans offered by various consultants. These may be modified to suit the needs of a particular organization and to ensure that they meet the requirements of the Act, namely gender-neutrality.

3. Factors and Sub-Factors

The following is a list of factors and sub-factors used in job evaluation. These are composite lists of sub-factors so there is overlap and repetition.[9]

Ability to do Detailed Work
Ability to do Routine Work
Ability to Make Decisions
Accuracy
Analytical Ability
Aptitude Required
Basic Knowledge and Experience
Capacity for Getting Along with Others
Capacity for Self Expression
Character of Supervision Given
Complexity of Duties
Creative Ability
Degree of Skill and Accuracy
Details
Dexterity
Difficulty of Operation
Difficulty of Work
Education
Education or Mental Development
Education or Trade Knowledge
Essential Education and Knowledge
Experience
Experience, Knowledge and Training Necessary
Experience and Training
Ingenuity
Initiative
Intelligence
Job Knowledge
Job Skill
Judgement and Initiative
Knowledge of Machinery and Dexterity with Tools
Knowledge of Materials and Processes
Managerial Techniques
Manual Accuracy and Quickness
Manual Dexterity
Manual or Motor Skills Knowledge
Mental Application
Mental Capability
Mental Requirement
Office Machine Operation
Personal Qualifications Needed for the Job
Personal Requirements
Physical Skill
Preparation for the Job
Previous Training
Resourcefulness
Schooling
Skill Requirements
Social Skills
Time Required to Adapt Skills
Time Required to Become 80% Effective
Time Required to Learn Trade
Training Required
Training Time
Versatility

Attention Demand
Concentration
Fatigue
Fatigue Due to Eye Strain
Honesty of Effort
Manual Effort
Mental Application
Mental Effort
Mental or Visual Demand
Monotony and Comfort
Monotony of Work
Muscular or Nerve Strain
Physical Application
Physical Demand
Physical Effort
Physical Requirement
Physical or Mental Fatigue
Pressure of Work
Visual Application
Volume of Work

Accuracy
Adjustability
Commitments, Property, Money or Records
Company Cash
Confidential Data
Contact with Others
Contact with Public, Customers and Personnel
Co-operation and Personality
Co-ordination
Cost of Errors
Dependability and Accuracy
Dependability
Details
Details to Master
Determining Company Policy
Effort of Errors
Effect on Other Operations
Equipment
Equipment or Process
Executive Responsibility
Goodwill and Public Relations
Machinery and Equipment
Market
Material
Material and Equipment
Material or Product
Methods
Monetary Responsibility
Necessary Accuracy in Checking, Counting and Weighting
Personnel
Physical Property
Plant and Services
Product
Protection of Materials
Quality
Records
Safety of Others
Spoilage of Materials
Supervision Executed
Supervision of Others
Work of Others

Working Conditions

Attendance
Attention to Details
Danger - Accident from Machinery or Equipment
Danger - from Lifting
Difficulty in Locating Work Elsewhere
Dirtiness of Working Conditions
Disagreeableness
Environment
Surroundings
Tangible Surroundings
Environment
Exposure to Accident Hazard
Exposure to Health Hazard
Hazards Involved
Intangible Conditions
Job Conditions
Monotony
Occupational Hazard Diseases
Out-of-Town Travel
Personal Hazard
Unavoidable Hazards
Working Conditions

Job Analysis

Job analysis is a critical part of the job evaluation process. This involves a study of the organization's jobs. Information about the duties and responsibilities of each job is obtained, analyzed and recorded in precise and consistent language. Where organizations choose to develop their own systems, job analysis often precedes the choice, definition and weighting of factors. Refer to Booklet 2 in this series "Job Analysis" available from the Manitoba Pay Equity Bureau.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Ronnie J. Steinberg, "Job Evaluation Methodologies and Comparable Worth Policy" (paper presented at a seminar on "New Concepts and Research Directions in Pay Determination", Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, November 8, 1984), p. 10.

[2] Ronnie J. Steinberg and Lois Haignere, "Equitable Compensation: Methodological Criteria for Comparable Worth", (paper presented at a conference on "Ingredients for Women's Employment", State University of New York, Albany, New York, 1985), p. 18.

[3] Helen Remick, "Major Issues In A Priori Applications", Comparable Worth and Wage Determination: Technical Possibilities and Political Realities. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Temple University Press, 1984, P. 99-117.

[4] Helen Remick, "Strategies for Creating Sound, Bias-Free Job Evaluation Plans - Job Evaluation and the EEO: the Emerging Issues", (papers presented at the IRC Colloquium, New York, 1978), pp. 1-4.

[5] Equal Opportunities Commission, Judging Equal Value. Manchester, England, 1984, p. 18.

[6] Equal Opportunities Commission, Job Evaluation Schemes Free of Sex Bias. Manchester, England, 1985, p. 6.

[7] Joan Acker, "Sex Bias in Job Evaluation: A Comparable Worth Issue" (paper presented at the Albany Conference, "Ingredients for Women's Employment Policy", Albany, New York, April 19, 1985) p. 17.

[8] Equal Opportunities Commission, Job Evaluation Schemes Free of Sex Bias, 1985, p. 8.

[9] David Belcher, Compensation Administration, Englewood

Acker, Joan. "Sex Bias in Job Evaluation: A Comparable Worth Issue". Paper presented at the conference "Ingredients for Women's Employment Policy", State University of New York, Albany, New York, April 19, 1985.

Bartley, Douglas L. Job Evaluation - Wage and Salary Administration. Don Mills, Ontario: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1981.

Belcher, David W. Compensation Administration. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1981.

Canadian Union of Public Employees, Job Evaluation Department. A Job Evaluation Approach to Wage and Salary Administration. Ottawa, Ontario, 1984.

Canadian Union of Public Employees, Job Evaluation Department. Job Analysis. Ottawa, Ontario, 1985.

Equal Opportunities Commission. Job Evaluation Schemes Free of Sex Bias. Manchester, England, 1984.

Gael, Sidney. Job Analysis: A Guide to Assessing Work Activities. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 1983.

McCormick, Ernest J. Job Analysis: Methods and Applications. New York, New York: AMACOM, 1979.

Remick, Helen. "Strategies for Creating Sound, Bias-Free Job Evaluation Plans - Job Evaluation and EEO: The Emerging Issues". Papers presented at the IRC Colloquium, September 14, 1978, New York, New York: Industrial Relations Counsellors, 1978.

Remick, Helen, ed. Comparable Worth and Wage Discrimination: Technical Possibilities and Political Realities. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Temple University Press, 1984.

Steinberg, Ronnie J. "Job Evaluation Methodologies and Comparable Worth Policy". Paper presented at a seminar on "New Concepts and Research Directions in Pay Determination, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, November 8, 1984.

Steinberg, Ronnie J., and Haignere, Lois. "Equitable Compensation: Methodological Criteria for Comparable Worth". Paper presented at the conference "Ingredients for Women's Employment Policy", State University of New York, Albany, New York, 1985.

Treiman, Donald J. "Job Evaluation: An Analytical Review - Interim Report to the Equal Opportunity Commission". Paper prepared for Committee on Occupational Classification and Analysis, Assembly of Behavioural and Social Sciences, National Research Academy Press, 1979.

Treiman, Donald J., and Hartmann, Heidi I. ed. Women, Work and Wages: Equal Pay for Jobs of Equal Value. Committee on Occupational Classification and Analysis, Assembly of Behavioural and Social Sciences, national Research Council. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1981.

Affirmative Action: A program that aims to remedy the effects of discriminatory hiring and training practices, and to achieve equitable employment opportunities for designated target groups including women, natives, visible minorities and the physically disabled.

Arbitration: The process by which a board or arbitrator, acting under the authority of legislation, a collective agreement or mutual consent of both parties to a dispute, hears both sides of a controversy and issues an award, which is ordinarily binding on both parties.

Award, Decision or Order: The final decision of an arbitrator, binding on both parties to the dispute.

Bargaining Agent: The exclusive representative of a group of workers or employers in the process of collective bargaining.

Bargain in Good Faith: The requirement that two parties meet and confer with minds open to persuasion with a view to reaching agreement.

Bargaining Unit: A group of employees recognized by the employer and certified by a labour board for the purpose of collective bargaining.

Benchmark Jobs: A representative sampling of jobs covering the spectrum of jobs in an organization. Benchmark jobs can be used as reference points in the design and application of a job evaluation system.

Collective bargaining: Method of determining wages, hours and other conditions of employment through direct negotiations between the union and employer.

Comparable worth: The principle that jobs can be compared even though they may be dissimilar in nature but equal or equivalent in terms of skill, effort, responsibility and working conditions. This term is often used in the United States and is synonymous with pay equity in Canada.

Compensation Policy: The standards which an organization uses in making wage and salary compensation decisions.

Complaint-based Legislation: Legislation which requires an employee(s) to identify an alleged inequity and file a complaint. The complaint is then reviewed and investigated and either confirmed or denied. A confirmed complaint requires correction.

Effort: The measurement of mental and physical application required in a job to adequately perform the assigned tasks.

Employee Representative: A representative of non-unionized employees.

Equal Pay for Equal (or Substantially the Same) Work: The principle that a woman doing the same or substantially the same work as a man in an establishment should receive equal pay.

Equal Pay for Work of Equal Value: The principle of paying equal pay for different jobs in an organization which are determined to contribute the same or comparable value to that organization. A principle which will eliminate gender-based wage discrimination. The terms pay equity or comparable worth can also be used to describe this concept.

Establishment: A term often used in pay equity legislation to define the "workplace". Manitoba's legislation requires comparison of jobs within an establishment, not outside the establishment.

Factor: A basic component or part of a job evaluation plan which is used to measure characteristics of a job. For pay equity purposes, four factors are measured. They are skill, effort, responsibility and working conditions.

Factor Comparison: A method of job evaluation which compares jobs by making judgments about which jobs contain more of certain compensable factors than others.

Female-dominated Job Class: For pay equity purposes, a job class with 10 or more employees, where 70% or more of the people in the job class are women.

Gender-bias: Any practice or program which incorporates discrimination between men and women, either directly or indirectly.

Gender-dominance: A job class which is occupied predominantly by women, or predominantly by men. According to Manitoba's legislation, a class is gender-dominated if it has 10 or more incumbents, with 70% or more of the same gender.

Gender-neutral: Any practice or program which does not incorporate or allow gender-discrimination between men and women, either directly or indirectly.

Implementation: For pay equity purposes, the carrying out of The Pay Equity Act with implementation complete after wage adjustments have been made.

Increment: The difference between two consecutive pay grades in a wage structure. For example, if pay grade one pays $5.00 per hour and pay grade two pays $5.17 per hour, 17 cents is the increment.

Industry-wide Bargaining: Collective bargaining that takes place on an industry-wide basis; terms and conditions of employment agreed upon cover all or a major portion of the organized employees in the industry.

Job Analysis: A systematic collection of the various tasks involved in a job or job class and the minimum requirements needed to perform the job adequately. The process of information gathering.

Job Class: "Class" or "class of positions" means a group of positions involving duties and responsibilities so similar that the same or like qualifications may reasonably be required for, and the same schedule or grade of pay can be reasonably applied to, all positions in the group.

Job Classification: A type of job evaluation whereby the total job is evaluated and is then slotted into a pay grade that has been defined. Each job is placed into the grade where the grade description most closely fits the particular job being evaluated.

Job Description: A written description of the requirements of the job including job duties, tasks, responsibilities and scope.

Job Evaluation: The process of comparing the value of jobs in order to determine the position of one job in relation to another.

Job Evaluation System: For purposes of pay equity, a single, gender-neutral evaluation system capable of measuring skill, effort, responsibility and working conditions.

Job Ghettoization: The concentration of women into low-paying, low status jobs.

Job Specifications: Identification of the amount, level or type of skill, effort, responsibility and working conditions required to perform the duties and responsibilities listed on the job description.

Labour-management Committee: Any committee having representation from both management and labour. They may discuss such topics as safety and health, training, or job evaluation.

Male-dominated Job Class. For pay equity purposes, a job class with 10 or more employees, where 70% or more of the incumbents in the job class are men.

Manitoba Labour Board: The board, provided for under The Labour Relations Act of Manitoba, which is responsible for certification of trade unions, the inclusion of dispute-settling provisions in collective agreements and investigation of complaints of bad faith in collective bargaining.

Method of Least Squares: The statistical procedure for computing a line of regression by finding the best fitting straight line for a set of points.

Non-traditional Jobs: Occupations which have generally been filled by either women or men to the exclusion of the other.

Occupational Segregation of Women: The concentration of women into a narrow range of occupations, primarily clerical, sales, service and health care.

Pay Equity: The concept of equal pay for work of equal value, based primarily on the relative value of work performed, irrespective of the gender of employees. Manitoba requires that no employer covered by The Pay Equity Act shall establish or maintain a difference between the wages paid to male and female employees, employed by that employer, who are performing work of equal or comparable value.

Point-rating or Point Factor: A method of job evaluation in which a rating scale is constructed for each factor, each factor receives a numerical score, scores are totaled and a job value is established.

Policy Capturing: A method of job evaluation which relies heavily on statistical procedures for capturing current pay policies of a company and identifying wage discrimination based on gender. Factors and weightings can then be adjusted to remove the identified wage discrimination.

Pro-active Pay Equity Legislation: Requires employers, in co-operation with employee representatives, to initiate an audit of their pay practice within specific timelines and to identify and correct any pay equities between male and female-dominated job classes of equal or comparable value.

Ranking: A method of job evaluation in which jobs in the organization are ranked in order on the basis of their importance to the organization or general difficulty.

Ratification: Formal approval of a newly negotiated agreement by vote of the union members affected, as well as by employers or employer associations.

Rating Committee: A committee established to objectively determine the value of jobs by applying the job evaluation system to the job content information.

Regression Analysis: Used to test for the impact of an independent variable on the dependent variable while statistically controlling for the effects of other independent variables. For pay equity purposes, it is used to estimate the relationship between point values of evaluated gender-dominated jobs and the pay rates.

Responsibility: Aspects such as accountability or decision making components of the job. Often measures consequence of responsibility such as cost factors, human relations, supervision.

Salary Range: The full progression of increments from starting rate to maximum for a particular job, job class, or pay scale.

Salary or Pay Line: For pay equity purposes, the determination of the female or male salary structure in a workplace. The pay line identifies the general trend of an organization's pay practice as applied to male and female-dominated job classes. Can be determined statistically by Method of Least Squares to produce a wage regression line.

Scattergram or Scatter Diagram: A diagram or graph, pictorially displaying the relative values of jobs or job classes and their respective wage rates.

Skill: The level of knowledge or ability required to perform the tasks of the job. Often measured in terms of education, experience and training.

Sub-factor: A further breakdown of identified factors. In job evaluation plans, a factor such as skill could have sub-factors such as education or on-the-job training; effort could be broken down into sub-factors such as physical effort and mental effort.

Systemic Discrimination: Discrimination in employment policies or practices that adversely affects certain groups even though the discrimination may not be overt or intended.

Systematic Undervaluation: A consistent application of bias by either application or design.

Under Representation: Where the number of women participating in a specific type of job is lower than the representation in the general population.

Wages: "Wages" means any form of remuneration payable or benefit provided by an employer for work performed by an individual. "Wage rate" has a corresponding meaning.

Wage Gap: The difference between the average wage paid to men and women.

Wage Structure: A systematic and logical arrangement of the compensation of an organization, usually called pay grades.

Weighting: The process of allocating a higher emphasis to one factor than another, so that the factors considered to be of relatively greater importance to an organization, assume greater importance.

Working Conditions: Encompasses the environmental surroundings and also the conditions under which the tasks are performed. These conditions could be either physical or psychological.